1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
9	AT SEAT	TLE
10	VICKI WILL ,	CASE NO. C22-1813 MJP
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER OF CONSOLIDATION
12	V.	
13	CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING, INC.,	
14	Defendant.	
15		
16		
17	The Court issues this Order <u>sua sponte</u> after reviewing the complaint (Dkt. No. 1-1) and	
18	the notice of related cases (Dkt. No. 13). The Court ORDERS that this matter be consolidated for	
19	all purposes with the consolidated matter of <u>Guy v. Convergent Outsourcing Inc.</u> , C22-1558	
20	MJP.	
21	Under Rule 42(a), the Court may consolidate cases that involve common questions of law	
22	or fact. Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). The Court enjoys broad discretion in making this determination.	
23	See Inv'rs Research Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for Cent. Dist. of Cal., 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir.	
24	1989). The Court usually considers several factors in analyzing consolidation, including judicial	

economy, whether consolidation would expedite resolution of the case, whether separate cases 2 may yield inconsistent results, and the potential prejudice to a party opposing. See 9 Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil § 2383 (3rd ed. 2020). 3 Consolidation is appropriate here given that this action presents common questions of law 4 5 and fact with those presented in the consolidated matter of Guy v. Convergent Outsourcing Inc. 6 and there are substantial efficiencies to be gained by consolidation. All of the actions concern the 7 same data breach resulting from a cyber-attack on Convergent. And the Plaintiff in this action pursues the same or similar causes of action against Convergent as the plaintiffs pursue in Guy 8 9 and on behalf of an overlapping proposed class. Consolidation for all purposes will conserve party and judicial resources. And the Court is unaware of any inconvenience, delay, confusion, 10 or prejudice that may result from consolidation. As such, the Court ORDERS that this matter be 11 12 CONSOLIDATED with Guy v. Convergent Outsourcing Inc., C22-1558 MJP. All filings in this action shall be filed on the docket of the first-filed case (C22-1558) with the following caption: 13 14 CASE NO. C22-1558 MJP LEO GUY, individually, and on behalf 15 of all others similarly situated, 16 Plaintiff, 17 v. 18 CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING, INC., 19 Defendant. 20 21 The Clerk is directed to file this Order on the docket of C22-1813 and administratively 22 close the action. 23 // 24

1	The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.
2	Dated January 13, 2023.
3	Marshy Melens
4	Marsha J. Pechman United States Senior District Judge
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	